

**OVERVIEW/REPORT STRUCTURE**

This report has been structured to present each chapter of the General Plan and any recommended changes since the draft document was made available and hearings were held. Minor technical or typographical changes that do not change the substance of the General Plan or the conclusions of the Program Environmental Impact Report (PEIR) will be made by staff prior to the final printing of the adopted Plan.

PREAMBLE

No changes are recommended.

INTRODUCTION**Recommended Changes****1. Expand Objective I-1 and Policy I-1.1 (Page I-15).**

Expand this objective to include the annual review of the Capital Improvement Program (CIP) as required by State Law.

LAND USE AND URBAN DESIGN ELEMENT**Recommended Changes****2. Change Figure LU-2 – Riverside Park (Page LU-9).**

Change this figure to include Arlington Avenue as a parkway. Add Arlington Avenue as a parkway under the “Parkways” discussion in the Land Use and Urban Design Element with the needed Objectives and Policies (Pages LU-34 - LU-39). The addition of Objectives and Policies under “Parkways” will cause all other Objectives and Policies in this Element to be renumbered.

3. Include Urban Design Framework Map (General Plan Figure A – Urban Design Framework Map) as Figure LU-3.

In the Land Use and Urban Design Element include this new Figure LU-3, renumbering all other Figures in this Element, the. As part of the preparation of the General Plan, The Arroyo Group (TAG) prepared the Urban Design Framework Map and City staff has found this map useful for various planning efforts.

4. **Change policies LU-11.2, LU-13.2 and LU-15.1 in the Land Use and Urban Design Element.**

Change these policies based on comments from Victoria Avenue Forever (VAF), (General Plan Figure B – Victoria Avenue Forever Letter).

LU-11.2 Recognize Victoria Avenue, Magnolia Avenue/Market Street, University Avenue, Van Buren Boulevard, Riverwalk Parkway, La Sierra Avenue, Canyon Crest Drive and Overlook Parkway as the fundamental elements of City's parkway **landscape network and components of Riverside Park.** (Page LU-35)

LU-13.2 Intersection improvements on Victoria Avenue related to the extension of Overlook Parkway shall be ~~permitted only where a Level of Service "D" or better can be maintained~~ **determined in conjunction with a specific plan to be prepared for Overlook Parkway between Alessandro Boulevard and the 91 freeway. The specific plan shall address the crossing of the Alessandro Arroyo, traffic calming measures necessary to protect local streets in the area and the extension of Overlook Parkway westerly of the intersection of Washington Street and Overlook Parkway. Acceptable levels of service of intersection(s) on Victoria Avenue related to the extension of Overlook Parkway shall be determined as part of the specific plan process. In any event, a** All improvements shall be designed to sensitively reflect the **Victoria** Avenue's historic character. (Page LU-36)

LU-15.1 Utilize the intersection of Van Buren Boulevard and Victoria Avenue as a ~~key access point~~ **highly landscaped, visual gateway into the City** to the City's parkways. (Page LU-37)

5. **Create a new section in “Citywide Objectives and Policies” section of the Land Use and Urban Design Element entitled “Linear Aerial Utility Facilities.”**

This section would emphasize the aesthetic need to underground utility lines throughout the City and would particularly cross reference the “Parkways” section Objectives LU-11 through LU-20 (including the new Arlington Avenue Parkway) as a starting point. The Objective and Policies of this section would include:

Objective: Minimize, to the extent practical, the visual impact of aerial facilities on the City's landscape.

Policy: Promote the formation of under grounding districts.

Policy: Investigate the feasibility of a City wide under grounding ordinance.

Policy: Investigate funding sources to under ground existing City owned utility facilities.

6. **Amend Figure LU-8 – Neighborhoods (Page LU-55).**

Amend this figure to reflect the La Sierra Neighborhood, with the Galleria, and the Magnolia Center Neighborhood, with the Riverside Plaza, as “Neighborhoods with Major Activity Centers.” This was noted in the correspondence received from the Greater Riverside Chambers of Commerce General Plan Task Force (General Plan Figure C – Greater Riverside Chambers of Commerce General Plan Task Force Letter, Recommended Changes Item #2).

7. **Delete Policy 28.4 (Page LU-60) from the General Plan.**

This policy was carried over from the 1994 General Plan. The existing Zoning Code does not have minimum lot size requirements for most commercial and office zones, and as such a policy of this nature was necessary to ensure that rezoned residential properties could be adequately converted to other uses. However, the new Zoning Code does have minimum lot size requirements for office, commercial, industrial and mixed use zones. Therefore, this policy is no longer needed.

8. **Delete the average densities as currently printed on Figure LU-9 – Land Use Policy Map (Page LU-63).**

These average densities were only intended to be used for technical studies and should not be part of this Figure.

9. **Amend Figure LU-9 – Land Use Policy Map per the “Staff Recommended Change:” listed after each Area discussion.**

As part of the original staff report prepared for the first public hearing on February 17, 2005, staff recommended additional areas for land use designation changes on Figure LU-9 – Land Use Policy Map. These were areas that the staff noted required general plan designation changes beyond the 29 sites reviewed by the CAC (General Plan Figure D – Citizen Advisory Committee Changes). A description of the site and the reason for the proposed change follows. (Comment Letters and Maps of Sites A through I can be found in General Plan Figure E – Sites A - I)

Area A1 –	<i>Comment Letters:</i>	None, but there has been verbal testimony
	<i>Address:</i>	See map
	<i>Existing General Plan:</i>	RMH – Medium High Density Residential
	<i>Existing Zone:</i>	R-3 – Multi-Family Residential & RR – Rural Residential
	<i>Proposed General Plan:</i>	HDR – High Density Residential & SRR – Semi Rural Residential
	<i>Proposed Zone:</i>	R-3-1500 – Multi-family Residential and RR – Rural Residential

Area A2 –	<i>Comment Letters:</i>	None
	<i>Address:</i>	4425 - 4625 Van Buren Boulevard
	<i>Existing General Plan:</i>	RMH – Medium High Density Residential
	<i>Existing Zone:</i>	R-1-65 – Single Family Residential
	<i>Proposed General Plan:</i>	HDR – High Density Residential
	<i>Proposed Zone:</i>	R-1-7000 – Single Family Residential

Area A3 –	<i>Comment Letters:</i>	None
	<i>Address:</i>	2900 - 3300 Iowa Avenue
	<i>Existing General Plan:</i>	CBO – Retail Business and Office
	<i>Existing Zone:</i>	R-1-65 – Single Family Residential
	<i>Proposed General Plan:</i>	HDR – High Density Residential
	<i>Proposed Zone:</i>	R-1-7000 – Single Family Residential

Concerns/Issues:

These three areas are proposed to be changed to High Density Residential (HDR) to accommodate the housing needs for the City in accordance with the Housing Element. These areas were chosen for the HDR designation due to their existing development and/or proximity to transit corridors.

Specifically for Area A1, these properties are proposed to be changed from RMH – Medium High Density Residential to HDR – High Density Residential. However, not all of the area is proposed for HDR. The properties on the south side of Area A1 are proposed for the SRR – Semi Rural Residential designation to accommodate the current RR – Rural Residential Zoning and semi-rural development of the properties. For Area A2 these properties are proposed to be changed from MHDR and for Area A3 the properties are proposed to be changed from CBO.

Staff Recommended Change:

Place Areas A1, A2 and A3 in the HDR land use designation.

Area B –	<i>Comment Letters:</i>	None
	<i>Address:</i>	6642 & 6643 Lake Street
	<i>Existing General Plan:</i>	RHD – High Density Residential
	<i>Existing Zone:</i>	R-3-R – Multi-family Residential
	<i>Proposed General Plan:</i>	MDR – Medium Density Residential
	<i>Proposed Zone:</i>	R-3-2500 – Multi-family Residential

Concerns/Issues:

These two properties are proposed to be changed from RHD – High Density Residential to MDR – Medium Density Residential to accommodate current plans for development of the properties and the existing medium density residential development surrounding the sites.

Staff Recommended Change:

Place Area B in the MDR land use designation.

Area C –	<i>Comment Letters:</i>	None
	<i>Address:</i>	See map
	<i>Existing General Plan:</i>	CBO – Retail Business & Office
	<i>Existing Zone:</i>	R-1-65 – Single Family Residential, WC – Water Course and R-3 – Multi-family Residential
	<i>Proposed General Plan:</i>	O – Office
	<i>Proposed Zone:</i>	R-1-7000 – Single Family Residential, R-1-7000-WC – Single Family Residential with the Water Course Overlay Zone and R-3-1500 – Multi-family Residential

Concerns/Issues:

This large property is owned by the Riverside County Transportation Commission (RCTC) and was previously designated for CBO. However, due to the limited access to the site and the proximity to single family residential development staff is recommending the O – Office land use designation. RCTC is in agreement with this proposed change.

Staff Recommended Change:

Place Area C the O land use designation.

Area D1 –	<i>Comment Letters:</i>	None, but there has been verbal testimony
	<i>Address:</i>	See map
	<i>Existing General Plan:</i>	CSV – Service Visitor Commercial, OLR – Low Rise Office, RLD – Low Density Residential & IBP – Industrial Business Park
	<i>Existing Zone:</i>	County
	<i>Proposed General Plan:</i>	B/OP – Business Office Park & I – Industrial
	<i>Proposed Zone:</i>	None
Area D2 –	<i>Comment Letters:</i>	None, but there has been verbal testimony
	<i>Address:</i>	See map
	<i>Existing General Plan:</i>	RMD – Medium Density Residential & RES – Estate Residential
	<i>Existing Zone:</i>	County
	<i>Proposed General Plan:</i>	MDR – Medium Density Residential
	<i>Proposed Zone:</i>	None

Concerns/Issues:

These areas were proposed for land use designation changes after a field visit of the area.

Area D1 is currently designated for such land uses as CSV – Service Visitor Commercial, OLR – Low Rise Office, LDR – Low Density Residential and IBP – Industrial Business Park. However a tour of this area reflected that much of the land is underutilized with industrial uses. Therefore, staff is recommending the B/OP – Business Office Park designation with the I – Industrial designation for the properties southerly of Center Street.

As a matter of information the Riverside County Integrated Plan (RCIP) General Plan has this area designated for a variety of residential designations including: Medium Density (2-5 du/ac); Medium High (5-8 du/ac); High (8-14 du/ac); Very High (14-20 du/ac); and Highest (20+ du/ac). The area southerly of Center Street adjacent to the railroad tracks is planned for Light Industrial uses.

Area D2 is predominately designated RES – Estate Residential. However, the property southerly of Spring Street is under construction with medium density residential uses. Therefore, staff is recommending the MDR – Medium Density Residential designation.

As a matter of information the Riverside County Integrated Plan (RCIP) General Plan has this area designated for Light Industrial uses. However, field visits of the area indicate that this area is being developed with residential subdivisions. In preparation of this staff report, staff spoke with the County to determine if the General Plan designation had recently changed in this area since residential development was under construction in an area planned for industrial. The area south of Spring Street does have a tentative map for residential development which is a permitted use in the Light Industrial General Plan designation. The area north of Center Street has had a recent plot plan submittal for a lumber and wood distribution and storage facility, however this project has not been to hearing yet. The large vacant lot between Center and Spring Streets has not had any development proposed at this time.

Implementation Tool #10 states, “Coordinate the General Plan land use designations within the City's sphere plan with the County's RCIP.” It is recommended that tool be revised.

Staff Recommended Change:

Place Areas D1 in the B/OP and I land use designations and Area D2 in the MDR land use designation.

Amend Tool #10 in the Implementation Plan to read as follows:

#10 Coordinate the General Plan land use designations within the City's sphere plan with the County's RCIP. **Particular emphasis should be placed on the Highgrove area including community meetings with the Highgrove Community Services Area Committee.**

Area E –	<i>Comment Letters:</i>	Gresham Savage Nolan & Tilden Letter on behalf of Christian Bergum
	<i>Address:</i>	See map
	<i>Existing General Plan:</i>	RES – Estate Residential
	<i>Existing Zone:</i>	RC – Residential Conservation
	<i>Proposed General Plan:</i>	HR – Hillside Residential
	<i>Proposed Zone:</i>	RC – Residential Conservation

Concerns/Issues:

These small properties, just easterly of the realigned Canyon Crest Drive, are currently designated RES – Estate Residential but zoned RC – Residential Conservation. The RC zoning cannot be changed, therefore, staff is recommending that the land use designation be changed to HR – Hillside Residential for General Plan consistency.

Staff Recommended Change:

Place Area E in the HR land use designation.

Area F1 –	<i>Comment Letters:</i>	Nossaman, Guthner, Knox & Elliott, LLP, John Clark Murphy
	<i>Address:</i>	See map
	<i>Existing General Plan:</i>	RHS – Hillside Residential, NOS – Natural Resources Open Space & RLD – Low Density Residential
	<i>Existing Zone:</i>	County
	<i>Proposed General Plan:</i>	C – Commercial, P – Public Park & LDR – Low Density Residential
	<i>Proposed Zone:</i>	None

Area F2 –	<i>Comment Letters:</i>	None
	<i>Address:</i>	See map
	<i>Existing General Plan:</i>	None
	<i>Existing Zone:</i>	County
	<i>Proposed General Plan:</i>	B/OP – Business Office Park
	<i>Proposed Zone:</i>	None

Concerns/Issues:

These areas are generally in the City's Sphere of Influence.

Area F1 is partly in the City's sphere and partly within the corporate limits. The properties located northwesterly of the intersection of Central Avenue and Sycamore Canyon Boulevard are on the City's plan as RHS – Hillside Residential. However, this piece of land is relatively flat and is better suited for commercial development. Therefore, staff is recommending the C – Commercial land use designation which is consistent with the County's General Plan, which proposes Commercial Retail. The letter from Mr. Murphy indicates that a significant amount of land and access has been taken from this property by Caltrans as part of the freeway widening project. As such the property owner is requesting that this piece of property be placed in the HDR – High Density Residential land use designation.

The properties southwesterly of this same intersection are designated NOS – Natural Open Space and LDR – Low Density Residential. However, the NOS has been placed on properties already developed with residences and the LDR is on property that is still open space. Staff recommends that the designations be realigned to reflect and protect the uses that are currently on the properties.

Area F2 is a portion of the City's sphere which has never been designated with a land use designation. This was an error, as it is part of the City's sphere. Given its proximity to March Air Reserve Base staff is recommending the B/OP – Business Office Park designation.

Staff Recommended Change:

Place Area F1 in the C, P & LDR land use designations, as noted on the exhibit in this report and Area F2 in B/OP in the land use designation.

Area G –	<i>Comment Letters:</i>	None
	<i>Address:</i>	See map
	<i>Existing General Plan:</i>	PFI – Public Facilities and Institutions
	<i>Existing Zone:</i>	County
	<i>Proposed General Plan:</i>	OS – Open Space/Natural Resources
	<i>Proposed Zone:</i>	None

Concerns/Issues:

This area is Lake Matthews. It is currently designated PFI – Public Facilities and Institutions. However, the PFI designation would permit a Floor Area Ratio of 1 and cause this land to be calculated for traffic modeling and Housing Element purposes. In addition, the PFI designation permits schools, hospitals, libraries and utilities. Since this property will never be developed, staff is recommending the designation of OS – Open Space/Natural Resources to better reflect the actual use of the property. The OS designation provides for land, both public and private, for the preservation of natural resources, hillsides, creeks, open space, floodways and stormwater retention areas.

Staff Recommended Change:

Place Area G in the OS land use designation.

Area H –	<i>Comment Letters:</i>	None
	<i>Address:</i>	4899 Palo Verde Lane
	<i>Existing General Plan:</i>	RMD – Medium Density Residential
	<i>Existing Zone:</i>	R-1-65 – Single Family Residential
	<i>Proposed General Plan:</i>	P – Public Park
	<i>Proposed Zone:</i>	R-1-7000 – Single Family Residential

Concerns/Issues:

This property, on the west side of Mount Rubidoux, is owned by the County Parks Department but is currently designated as RMD – Medium Density Residential. Since this parcel is part of the park, staff is recommending that the designation be changed to P – Public Park for General Plan consistency.

Staff Recommended Change:

Place Area H in the P land use designation.

Area I –	<i>Comment Letters:</i>	Many Letters and verbal testimony
	<i>Address:</i>	See map
	<i>Existing General Plan:</i>	OLR – Low Rise Office, RMD – Medium Density Residential & RHD – High Density Residential
	<i>Existing Zone:</i>	C-2 – Restricted Commercial, RO – Restricted Office, P – Parking, R-1-65 – Single Family Residential & R-3-R – Multi-family Residential
	<i>Proposed General Plan:</i>	O – Office

Proposed Zone:

CR – Commercial Retail, O – Office, R-1-7000 – Single Family Residential, R-3-2500 – Multi-family Residential

Concerns/Issues:

This triangular area is bounded by Central Avenue on the north, the 91 Freeway on the east and Riverside Avenue on the west. The current General Plan designations in this area are RHD – High Density Residential, RMD – Medium Density Residential, and OLR – Low Rise Office. Office buildings are currently built along Central Avenue, with Multi-family Residential in the area of the Riverside Avenue and 91 Freeway intersection and Single Family Residential in the middle, many of which are said to be rentals. The long term viability of the area may be more appropriate for other uses, especially given the proximity to the freeway. Therefore, the City Council, acting as the Redevelopment Agency, directed staff to study this area for addition into the Magnolia Center Redevelopment Project Area. Based on this fact, a final decision was recently made by staff to propose this area for the O – Office designation.

In the correspondence received from the Greater Riverside Chambers of Commerce General Plan Task Force (General Plan Figure C – Greater Riverside Chambers of Commerce General Plan Task Force Letter, Recommended changes Item #9) it is recommended that this area be developed simultaneously and not in a piecemeal manner to protect the existing neighborhood.

Staff Recommended Change:

Place Area I in the O land use designation and under the Magnolia Center Neighborhood add Policy LU-65.6 (Page LU-112) to read as follows:

To protect to the existing residential uses, the triangular area bounded by Central Avenue on the north, the 91 Freeway on the east and Riverside Avenue on the west is encouraged to be developed simultaneously in an inclusive manner and not developed as piecemeal development.

10. **Amend Figure LU-9 – Land Use Policy Map per the “Staff Recommended Change:” listed after each Area discussion.**

Since the original staff report was published on February 17, 2005 the Commission and staff has heard much testimony and has continued with additional research cumulating in additional supplemental reports. These reports highlight those areas where General Plan designations were applied in error or where, to accommodate Zoning designation changes, the General Plan is recommended for change at this time. A description of the site and the

reason for the proposed change follows. (Comment Letters and Maps of Sites J through V can be found in General Plan Figure F – Sites J - V)

Area J –	<i>Comment Letters:</i>	Redevelopment Memo/Bonnett Irrigation Letter/Central Aire, Inc. Letter
	<i>Address:</i>	3215 and 3245 Madison Street
	<i>Existing General Plan:</i>	RMD – Medium Density Residential
	<i>Existing Zone:</i>	M-2 – General Manufacturing
	<i>Proposed General Plan:</i>	MDR – Medium Density Residential
	<i>Proposed Zone:</i>	R-1-7000 – Single Family Residential

Concerns/Issues:

This area was reviewed at the April 21, 2005 hearing, in the context of zoning, when commercial zoning was discussed. The Redevelopment Agency is requesting that the proposed general plan and zoning designations for the properties northerly of Evans Street on both sides of Madison Street be changed. In addition, they are requesting to change the general plan designation from MDR – Medium Density Residential to C – Commercial on the northeast corner of Madison and Evan Streets. The corners are currently developed with commercial uses. The proposed changes further the goals of the Casa Blanca Redevelopment Project Area by aiding in the revitalization of this important area.

Staff Recommended Change:

Place the two properties at 3215 and 3245 Madison Street in the C land use designation.

Area K –	<i>Comment Letters:</i>	B. Lorraine Walker Letter
	<i>Address:</i>	3770 & 3780 Washington Street
	<i>Existing General Plan:</i>	RMD – Medium Density Residential
	<i>Existing Zone:</i>	RO – Restricted Office & P – Parking
	<i>Proposed General Plan:</i>	MDR – Medium Density Residential
	<i>Proposed Zone:</i>	O – Office & R-1-7000 – Single Family Residential

Concerns/Issues:

This area was also reviewed on April 21, 2005 as part of the office zoning discussion. The two properties in question, are parking lots for the office building at the southwest corner of Washington Street and Magnolia Avenue. This office building is proposed for a general plan designation of MU-V – Mixed Use Village. At the April 21, 2005 hearing it was recommended that the parking lots be rezoned from R-1-7000 to O – Office. In addition, staff also noted that parking lots should be designated on the General Plan for MU-V – Village since they are part of the project on the corner.

Staff Recommended Change:

Place the properties at 3770 and 3780 Washington Street in the MU-V land use designation.

Area L –	<i>Comment Letters:</i>	Stremricks Heritage Foods, Rob Ball Letter
	<i>Address:</i>	11503 Pierce Street
	<i>Existing General Plan:</i>	PFI – Public Facilities and Institutions
	<i>Existing Zone:</i>	M-1 – Light Manufacturing Zone
	<i>Proposed General Plan:</i>	PF – Public Facilities Institutional
	<i>Proposed Zone:</i>	PF – Public Facilities Zone

Concerns/Issues:

This is another area reviewed on April 21, 2005 as part of the industrial zoning discussion. At that time it was recommended that the property be rezoned to the BMP - Business Manufacturing Zone. To create consistency with the recommended BMP some the general plan land use designation should be changed to B/OP – Business Office Park.

Staff Recommended Change:

Place the properties at 11503 Pierce Street in the B/OP land use designation.

Area M –	<i>Comment Letters:</i>	Many Letters of Concerns, Petitions and Testimony
	<i>Address:</i>	The subject area is generally bounded by City limit line to the north, Fremont Street to the east, Jurupa Avenue to the south and Jasmine Street and Columbia Avenue to the west.
	<i>Existing General Plan:</i>	IBP – Industrial Business Park and ILT – Light Industrial
	<i>Existing Zone:</i>	MP – Manufacturing park and M-1 – Light Manufacturing Zone
	<i>Proposed General Plan:</i>	B/OP – Business Office Park
	<i>Proposed Zone:</i>	BMP – Business Manufacturing Park Zone

Concerns/Issues:

This area, reviewed on April 21, 2005 as part of the industrial zoning discussion, was originally proposed for the BMP – Business Manufacturing Park Zone and is now recommended for the I – Industrial Zone. With the recommended I – Industrial Zone the property should be placed in the I – Industrial general plan designation for consistency.

Staff Recommended Change:

Place the properties, as noted in the exhibit, in the I land use designation.

Area N –	<i>Comment Letters:</i>	All Electric Contracting, Irwin Gisler Letter
	<i>Address:</i>	The subject area is generally bounded by Jurupa Avenue to the south and consists of the properties fronting on Winterhaven Avenue, Orangewood Drive and Rickenbacker Avenue
	<i>Existing General Plan:</i>	IBP – Industrial Business Park
	<i>Existing Zone:</i>	M-1 – Light Manufacturing Zone
	<i>Proposed General Plan:</i>	B/OP – Business Office Park
	<i>Proposed Zone:</i>	BMP – Business Manufacturing Park Zone

Concerns/Issues:

This area, reviewed on April 21, 2005 as part of the industrial zoning discussion, was originally proposed for the BMP – Business Manufacturing Park Zone and is now recommended for the I – Industrial Zone. With the recommended I – Industrial Zone the property should be placed in the I – Industrial general plan designation for consistency.

Staff Recommended Change:

Place the properties, as noted in the exhibit, in the I land use designation.

Area O –	<i>Comment Letters:</i>	Jeff Brown Letter
	<i>Address:</i>	4006, 4020, 4032, 4046 & 4060 Maplewood Place
	<i>Existing General Plan:</i>	RMD – Medium Density Residential
	<i>Existing Zone:</i>	R-1-65 – Single Family Residential
	<i>Proposed General Plan:</i>	MU-N – Mixed Use Neighborhood
	<i>Proposed Zone:</i>	R-1-7000 – Single Family Residential

Concerns/Issues:

These five single family residential lots front on Maplewood Place across from other single family residential lots. These properties are currently general plan designated MDR – Medium Density Residential and were picked up as part of CAC Site #20 and proposed for MU-N – Mixed Use Neighborhood. Due to the existing development of these properties and their relationship with the residential neighborhood across Maplewood Place it is recommended that these properties remain in the Medium Density Residential general plan designation.

Staff Recommended Change:

Place the properties at 4006, 4020, 4032, 4046 & 4060 Maplewood Place in the MDR land use designation.

Area P –	<i>Comment Letters:</i>	Grove Community Church, Mike Barnes Letter
	<i>Address:</i>	See Map
	<i>Existing General Plan:</i>	PKP – Public Parks
	<i>Existing Zone:</i>	RC – Residential Conservation, R-1-130 – Single Family Residential & R-1-65 – Single Family Residential
	<i>Proposed General Plan:</i>	P – Public Park
	<i>Proposed Zone:</i>	RC – Residential Conservation, R-1-½ – Single Family Residential & R-1-7000 – Single Family Residential

Concerns/Issues:

This area was brought to our attention by Mike Barnes the Executive Pastor of Grove Community Church. One of the parcels the church owns is currently zoned R-1-130 – Single Family Residential and general plan designated PKP – Public Parks. Under the proposed General Plan this designation was carried forward and the property is proposed to be designated P – Public Park and proposed for R-1-½ acre Zone. While researching this property staff noted that some other privately owned properties to the north and south had similar general plan/zoning inconsistencies.

Staff Recommended Change:

Area P1 – Place this area in the HR – Hillside Residential land use designation.

Area P2 – Place this area in the VLDR – Very Low Density Residential land use designation.

Area P3 – Place this area in the MDR – Medium Density Residential land use designation.

Area Q –	<i>Comment Letters:</i>	The Recycler Core Company, Inc, Kenneth Lee Meier, Phillip J. Tonkin & Greater Riverside Chambers of Commerce General Plan Task Force Letters & verbal testimony
	<i>Address:</i>	See map
	<i>Existing General Plan:</i>	IGN – General Industrial

<i>Existing Zone:</i>	M-2 – General Manufacturing, M-1 – Light Manufacturing, R-1-65 – Single Family Residential & P – Parking
<i>Proposed General Plan:</i>	O – Office
<i>Proposed Zone:</i>	BMP – Business Manufacturing Park and R-1-7000 – Single Family Residential

Concerns/Issues:

This area is CAC Site 28, the area bounded by the 91 Freeway on the west, the 60 Freeway on the north, the railroad tracks and Kansas Avenue on the east and Third Street on the South. Today, it is predominately developed with heavy industrial uses. As the Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC) reviewed this area they saw this area as a major visual gateway into the City from the City's two major freeways, especially with the new freeway overpass project. Over the next twenty years they saw these unsightly uses being replaced with office uses and recommended the O – Office General Plan designation.

In consolidating the industrial zones under the new Zoning Code staff recommended that the M-2 – General Manufacturing Zone within this area be rezoned to the new BMP – Business Manufacturing Park Zone to begin the process of moving this area toward the Office general plan designation.

Throughout the hearing process the Commission has heard testimony about this area. In addition, the Greater Riverside Chambers of Commerce General Plan Task Force has reviewed this area and has made an alternate recommendation (General Plan Figure C – Greater Riverside Chambers of Commerce General Plan Task Force Letter, Recommended Changes Item #8). Their alternate recommendation seeks to meet the intent of the CAC's recommendation while limiting the extent of the conversion of heavy industrial uses to office uses. The recommendation is to put the area between the 91 Freeway and the railroad tracks, Area Q1, into the O – Office general plan designation and leave the rest of the area in the I – Industrial general plan designation.

Staff Recommended Change:

Area Q1 – Place this area in the O – Office land use designation.

Area Q2 – Place this area in the I – Industrial land use designation.

Area R –	<i>Comment Letters:</i>	Reliable Properties, Huble L. Byrne & Greater Riverside Chambers of Commerce General Plan Task Force Letters & verbal testimony
	<i>Address:</i>	See map
	<i>Existing General Plan:</i>	MXO – Mixed Use Office

<i>Existing Zone:</i>	C-2-SP – Restricted Commercial and Specific Plan Overlay Zone, P-SP – Parking and Specific Plan Overlay Zone & C-3-SP – General Commercial and Specific Plan Overlay Zone
<i>Proposed General Plan:</i>	MU-V – Mixed Use Village
<i>Proposed Zone:</i>	CR-SP – Commercial Retail and Specific Plan Overlay Zone & CG-SP – Commercial General and Specific Plan Overlay Zone

Concerns/Issues:

This is the site generally known as Town Square in the University Avenue Specific Plan. The property owner has testified at a number of the hearings requesting that this property be proposed for the MU-U – Mixed Use Urban general plan designation. In addition, Chris Buydos, the Economic Development Manager for the University of California Riverside, and the Greater Riverside Chambers of Commerce General Plan Task Force (General Plan Figure C – Greater Riverside Chambers of Commerce General Plan Task Force Letter, Recommended changes Item #5) have also recommended this area for the MU-U general plan designation.

Staff Recommended Change:

Place this area in the MU-U – Mixed Use Urban land use designation.

Area S –	<i>Comment Letters:</i>	GFB-Friedrich & Associates., Inc. - G. F. Brewton Letter, Riyoko Ishii Wylie Letter and Mark Boone Letters
	<i>Address:</i>	See map
	<i>Existing General Plan:</i>	ILT – Light Industrial and IBP – Industrial Business Park
	<i>Existing Zone:</i>	M-1 – Light Manufacturing & M-2 – General Manufacturing
	<i>Proposed General Plan:</i>	B/OP – Business Office Park
	<i>Proposed Zone:</i>	BMP – Business Manufacturing Park

Concerns/Issues:

This area, reviewed on April 21, 2005 as part of the industrial zoning discussion, was originally proposed for the BMP – Business Manufacturing Park Zone and is now recommended for the I – Industrial Zone. It is located within the Hunter Business Park Specific Plan and is part of the General Industrial District. With the recommended I – Industrial Zone the property should be placed in the I – Industrial general plan designation for consistency.

Staff Recommended Change:

Place the properties, as noted in the exhibit, in the I land use designation.

Area T –	<i>Comment Letters:</i>	UDO Real Estate LTD., Elliot S. Zorensky Letter
	<i>Address:</i>	See map
	<i>Existing General Plan:</i>	CBO – Retail Business & Office
	<i>Existing Zone:</i>	C-2 – Restricted Commercial, R-1-65 – single Family Residential & WC – Water Course
	<i>Proposed General Plan:</i>	C – Commercial
	<i>Proposed Zone:</i>	CR – Commercial Retail, R-1-7000 – Single Family Residential & CR-WC – Commercial Retail & Water Course Overlay Zone

Concerns/Issues:

The proposed Mixed Use Village general plan designation is on the westerly border of the subject property. The subject property was not consider for the Mixed Use village designation due to its current development with big box retail uses. However, over the next twenty years this area at the northwest corner of Tyler Street and Magnolia Avenue could be redeveloped as a mixed use project or continue to remain in the current commercial development configuration. Therefore, proposed the Mixed Use village general plan designation on this area would add greater flexibility to the property owners while not causing existing uses to become nonconforming.

Staff Recommended Change:

Place the subject properties, as noted in the exhibit, in the MU-V land use designation.

Area U –	<i>Comment Letters:</i>	Greater Riverside Chambers of Commerce General Plan Task Force Letter
	<i>Address:</i>	1145 Everton Place
	<i>Existing General Plan:</i>	RHD – High Density Residential
	<i>Existing Zone:</i>	C-2-SP – Restricted Commercial & Specific Plan Overlay Zone
	<i>Proposed General Plan:</i>	HDR – High Density Residential
	<i>Proposed Zone:</i>	CR-SP – Commercial Retail & Specific Plan Overlay Zone

Concerns/Issues:

In the letter received from the Greater Riverside Chambers of Commerce General Plan Task Force (General Plan Figure C – Greater Riverside Chambers of Commerce General Plan Task Force Letter, Recommended

Changes Item #6) they recommend that the designation on this property be changed from HDR – High Density Residential to PF – Public Facilities/Institutional since the property is owned by the University of California Riverside (UCR).

Staff Recommended Change:

Place the subject property in the PF land use designation.

Area V –	<i>Comment Letters:</i>	Greater Riverside Chambers of Commerce General Plan Task Force Letter
	<i>Address:</i>	See map
	<i>Existing General Plan:</i>	CSC – Commercial Centers
	<i>Existing Zone:</i>	R-3 – Multi-family Residential, C-3 – General Commercial, C-2 – Restricted Commercial & C-1 – Neighborhood shopping Center
	<i>Proposed General Plan:</i>	MU-V – Mixed Use Village
	<i>Proposed Zone:</i>	R-3-1500 – Multi-family Residential, CG – Commercial General & CR – Commercial Retail

Concerns/Issues:

In the letter received from the Greater Riverside Chambers of Commerce General Plan Task Force (General Plan Figure C – Greater Riverside Chambers of Commerce General Plan Task Force Letter, Recommended changes Item #7) they recommend that the designation on this property be changed from MU-V – Mixed Use Village to MU-U – Mixed Use Urban to accommodate the population growth around the University of California Riverside (UCR).

Staff Recommended Change:

Place the subject property in the MU-U and HDR land use designation as shown on the map.

11. Consider amending Figure LU-9 – Land Use Policy Map for the following areas.

During the hearing process the Planning Commission asked staff to research some areas that came up during public testimony. In addition, staff has also provided research on other areas which may be of interest to the Commission based upon letters of request. No recommendation on these areas is provided, as staff believes the current recommended general plan designation is appropriate. (Comment Letters and Maps of Sites W through AAA can be found in General Plan Figure G – Sites W - AAA)

Area W – *Comment Letters:* S & J Precision Tool, Inc., Ken Hook, & Lubrication & Environmental Equipment Corporation, Ms. Stephanie Stratton Letters & verbal testimony

Address: See map

Existing General Plan: IBP – Industrial Business Park

Existing Zone: M-1 – Light Manufacturing

Proposed General Plan: B/OP – Business Office Park

Proposed Zone: BMP – Business Manufacturing Park

Concerns/Issues:

This area is the City's westerly gateway into the City on the 91 Freeway. During the Commission hearings testimony was heard concerning the proposed change of zone from the M-1 – Light Manufacturing Zone to the BMP – Business Manufacturing Park Zone. It appears the property owners' preference would be for the I – Industrial Zone and I – Industrial general plan designation.

Area X – *Comment Letters:* Brian C. Percy on behalf of Rizzco Automotive Repair, Inc. Letter & verbal testimony

Address: See map

Existing General Plan: IBP – Industrial Business Park

Existing Zone: M-1 – Light Manufacturing & MP – Manufacturing Park

Proposed General Plan: B/OP – Business Office Park

Proposed Zone: BMP – Business Manufacturing Park

Concerns/Issues:

This area is southerly of Jurupa Avenue across from the Jasmine/Jurupa Area, noted as Site M of this staff report. These lots are very similar in lot size and development as those in Site M and may also be suitable for the I – Industrial Zone and I – Industrial General Plan designation.

Area Y – *Comment Letters:* Gresham Savage Nolan & Tilden, Alicen Clark Wong on behalf of Brad Pope Letter & verbal testimony

Address: See map

Existing General Plan: IBP – Industrial Business Park

Existing Zone: M-1 – Light Industrial

Proposed General Plan: B/OP – Business Office Park

Proposed Zone: BMP – Business Manufacturing Park

Concerns/Issues:

The subject, 5.98 acre property, is developed with a commercial poultry feed warehouse and mill adjacent to a railroad spur. City permit records for this site go back as far as 1958. The property fronts on, and takes access from, Van Buren Boulevard. Due to Van Buren Boulevard crossing below the railroad tracks in front of this property, visibility of this property is very limited. Although this area is surrounded by business office park uses, Mr. Pope is requesting the I – Industrial general plan designation and zoning on this property so his existing use will not become nonconforming. In a meeting with City staff on April 28, 2005, Mr. Pope did indicate that he may be agreeable to additional setback and landscaping requirements, similar to those of the BMP – Business Manufacturing Zone, to give the property the appearance of the BMP Zone from the surrounding properties.

Area Z –	<i>Comment Letters:</i>	Roy H. Nierman, Mark Howe, California Baptist University & Greater Riverside Chambers of Commerce General Plan Task Force Letters & verbal testimony
	<i>Address:</i>	See map
	<i>Existing General Plan:</i>	CBO – Retail Business & Office
	<i>Existing Zone:</i>	C-1-A – Community Shopping Center and C-2 – Restricted Commercial
	<i>Proposed General Plan:</i>	MU-V – Mixed Use Village
	<i>Proposed Zone:</i>	CR – Commercial Retail

Concerns/Issues:

The property owner was originally concerned about the proposed MU-V general plan designation thinking it was zoning being applied to the property. Once they understood that this was a general plan designation offering them greater flexibility in the future, they felt more comfortable with the proposal.

In addition to the letters received from the property owner, letters were also received from California Baptist University and the Greater Riverside Chambers of Commerce General Plan Task Force (General Plan Figure C – Greater Riverside Chambers of Commerce General Plan Task Force Letter, Recommended Changes Item #3) recommending the MU-U – Mixed Use Urban designation on this property.

Area AA –	<i>Comment Letters:</i>	Bingham McCutchen, Sanford M. Skaggs & Greater Riverside Chambers of Commerce General Plan Task Force Letters
	<i>Address:</i>	See map
	<i>Existing General Plan:</i>	IGN – General Industrial
	<i>Existing Zone:</i>	M-1 – Light Industrial & M-2 – General Manufacturing

Proposed General Plan: B/OP – Business Office Park
Proposed Zone: BMP – Business Manufacturing Park

Concerns/Issues:

The property owner is concerned with the proposed B/OP general plan designation and the BMP zoning in light of current and future operations for the property. In the letter, they address areas of concerns and suggestions for change to both the General Plan and Zoning text in regards to the subject property.

In addition to the letter received from the property owner, the Greater Riverside Chambers of Commerce General Plan Task Force (General Plan Figure C – Greater Riverside Chambers of Commerce General Plan Task Force Letter, Opposition to Specific Proposals Item #4) recommends the I – Industrial designation on this property.

Area AAA – *Comment Letters:* Best Best & Krieger LLP, Donald F. Zimmer
Letter
Address: 3735 & 3739 Nelson Street & 6781 & 6789
Brockton Avenue
Existing General Plan: CBO – Retail Business & Office
Existing Zone: C-3 – General Commercial
Proposed General Plan: C – Commercial
Proposed Zone: CG – Commercial General

Concerns/Issues:

A mapping error incorrectly had this area general plan designated for O – Office and notices were mailed to the property owners. Since this matter was brought to the City's attention through the hearing process the mapping error has been corrected and corrected notices were sent to the property owners.

12. **Include all previously approved General Plan Amendments and annexations that are processed for adoption after the LU-9 – Land Use Policy Map was printed as technical corrections which can be made by staff after adoption of this plan.**

13. **Add Policy LU-66.4 under the Magnolia Center Neighborhood (page LU-112).**

The policy should read as follows:

For the area on both side of Mount Vernon Street between Madison Street and San Rafael Way, lot consolidation of one acre lot sizes or greater is encouraged.

14. **Add Policy LU-66.5 under the Magnolia Center Neighborhood (page LU-112) and Policy LU-76.6 under the Ramona Neighborhood (page LU-126) which would read as follows:**

Development of properties along Magnolia Avenue, general plan designated VHDR – Very High Density Residential, shall be large scale meaningful development, sensitive to surrounding land uses, which would normally include whole block faces.

The Citizen's Advisory Committee's (CAC) Recommendation for VHDR along Magnolia Avenue has merit given the proposed bus rapid transit along the avenue. In addition, this substantial block of VHDR designated land, along both sides of Magnolia Avenue, is important for the City in meeting the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) numbers set by Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) for the City's Housing Element. However, the shallow lot depths causes concerns for the established residential neighborhoods behind these areas. The above policy will help to ensure that meaningful development sensitive to the existing residential neighborhood is contemplated in these areas.

In addition, it is also recommended that Area 1 on General Plan Figure H – VHDR - CAC Site 16 be removed from this CAC site area and placed in the MDR – Medium Density Residential general plan designation. Area 2 on this Figure is mentioned in the General Plan Figure C – Greater Riverside Chambers of Commerce General Plan Task Force Letter, Recommended Changes Item #4. Staff has no recommendation concerning this area.

Staff Recommended Change:

Place Area 1 General Plan Figure H – VHDR - CAC Site 16 in the MDR land use designation.

15. Add an objective, under the Northside Neighborhood (Pages LU-115 - LU-120).

The objective should be to coordinate trail alignments within the Springbrook Wash and the Santa Ana River in concert with the work prepared by the Springbrook Wash Trails Alignment Subcommittee of the Riverside Land Conservancy.

16. Add a more detailed discussion of the actual sphere boundary and the existing land use designations for the southern most sphere.

This discussion shall be added for clarity under the “Sphere of Influence” discussion beginning on page LU-140. When the General Plan was drafted staff had been given direction to reduce the City's sphere as shown on Figures I-1 and LU-1 – Planning Area Maps. However, after the draft General Plan was released, the City Council took action to keep the City's sphere boundaries as adopted in 1994. In May 1998 the City Council adopted a sphere plan for the Southern Sphere (General Plan Figure I – Southern Sphere), and this plan remains in effect with no changes proposed.

17. Add a General Plan/Zoning Consistency Matrix under the section on “Implications of Land Use Policy” on page LU-155 in the Land Use and Urban Design Element.

The matrix better explains the relationship of the City's General Plan with the Zoning Code. As a Charter City, the City is not required to have consistent General Plan and Zoning designations. Nevertheless, the City does strive toward this consistency. Therefore, it is recommended that the following table be added to this section of the General Plan.

**TABLE LU-4
ZONING/GENERAL PLAN CONSISTENCY MATRIX**

General Plan Land Use Designation	GP Symbol	Zone Symbol	Zoning Designation
Single-Family Residential Land Use Designations			
Agricultural/Rural Residential (Max. 0.20 du/acre)	A/RR	RA-5	Residential Agriculture
Hillside Residential (Max. 0.63 du/acre)	HR	RC	Residential Conservation
Semi-Rural Residential (Max. 3.3 du/acre)	SRR	RR	Rural Residential
Very Low Density Residential (Max. 3.3 du/acre)	VLDR	RE R-1-1/2 acre	Residential Estate R-1-1/2 acre – Single Family
Low Density Residential (Max. 6.0 du/acre)	LDR	RE R-1-1/2 acre R-1-13000 R-1-10500 CS	Residential Estate R-1-1/2 acre – Single Family R-1-13000 – Single Family R-1-10500 – Single Family Commercial Storage Overlay
Medium Density Residential (Max. 8.0 du/acre)	MDR	RE R-1-1/2 acre R-1-13000 R-1-10500 R-1-8500 R-1-7000 CS MH	Residential Estate R-1-1/2 acre – Single Family R-1-13000 – Single Family R-1-10500 – Single Family R-1-8500 – Single Family R-1-7000 – Single Family Commercial Storage Overlay Mobile Home Park
Multi-Family Residential Land Use Designations			
Medium-High Density (Max. 14.5 du/acre)	MHDR	R-3-4000 R-3-3000 CS	R-3-4000 – Multi-family R-3-3000 – Multi-family Commercial Storage Overlay
High Density Residential (Max. 29 du/acre)	HDR	R-3-4000 R-3-3000 R-3-2000 R-3-1500 CS	R-3-4000 – Multi-family R-3-3000 – Multi-family R-3-2000 – Multi-family R-3-1500 – Multi-family Commercial Storage Overlay
Very High Density Residential (Max.40 du/acre)	VHDR	R-4	R-4 – Multi-family
Commercial and Industrial Land Use Designations			
Commercial (Max. 0.50 FAR/acre)	C	CR CG CS NC	Commercial Retail Commercial General Commercial Storage Overlay Neighborhood Commercial Overlay

General Plan Land Use Designation	GP Symbol	Zone Symbol	Zoning Designation
Commercial Regional Center (Max. 0.20 FAR/acre)	CRC	CRC	Commercial Regional Center
Office (Max. 1.0 FAR/acre)	O	O CS	Office Commercial Storage Overlay
Business/Office Park (Max. 1.50 FAR/acre)	B/OP	BMP AI CS	Business and Manufacturing Park Air Industrial Commercial Storage Overlay
Industrial (Max. 0.60 FAR/acre)	I	I CS AIR	General Industrial Commercial Storage Overlay Airport Zone
Mixed Use Designations			
Downtown Specific Plan (Various du and FAR/acre)	DSP	DSP	Downtown Specific Plan
Mixed Use – Neighborhood (Max. 10 du/acre, 1.0 FAR/acre)	MU-N	MU-N	Mixed Use - Neighborhood
Mixed Use – Village (Max. 30/40* du/acre, 2.5 FAR/acre)	MU-V	MU-V	Mixed Use - Village
Mixed Use – Urban (Max. 40/60* du/acre, 4.0 FAR/acre)	MU-U	MU-U	Mixed Use - Urban
Community Amenities and Support Designations			
Agriculture (Max. 0.20 du/acre)	A	RA-5	Residential Agriculture
Public Parks	P	PF	Public Facilities
Private Recreation	PR	All Zones per the Require- ments of Title 19	Public Facilities
Open Space/Natural Resources	OS	PF	Public Facilities
Public Facilities and Institutional Uses (Max. 1.0 FAR/acre)	PF	PF AIR	Public Facilities Airport
All General Plan Land Use Designa- tions		RWY AP X S SP WC	Railway Airport Protection Overlay Building Setback Overlay Story Overlay Specific Plan Overlay Water Course Overlay

*See Table LU-3 (Land Use Designations)

CIRCULATION AND COMMUNITY MOBILITY ELEMENT

Recommended Changes

18. **Modify Figure CCM-4 – Master Plan of Roadways to identify the streets that are proposed as parkways on the Riverside Park Map (LU-2).**

This will help to ensure these parkways are maintained at a level necessary to continue the Riverside Park as it is recommended.

19. **Modify Figure CCM-4 – Master Plan of Roadways to reflect the addition, deletion and reclassification of a number of streets:**

Addition

- “A” Street connection proposed under the recent joint City/County planning effort for roadway alignments in the Rancho El Sobrante area. This would include the realignment of McAllister Street to connect to La Sierra Avenue in the vicinity of Dufferin Avenue and the addition of a new collector road from McAllister Street easterly to Van Buren Boulevard. These agreed upon modifications serve to ease the impacts to the City residents along McAllister Street southerly of Victoria Avenue and to Victoria Avenue through the greenbelt.
- Barton Road between Alessandro Boulevard and Grove Community Parkway should be shown on the plan (as a 66 Foot Collector).
- Iris Avenue between Washington Street and Chicago Avenue should be shown as a 66 Foot Local, like Roberts Road.
- Dauchy Avenue between Gentian Avenue and Van Buren Boulevard should be shown as a 66 Foot Local, like Roberts Road.

Deletion

- The 1994 General Plan shows Oleander Avenue between La Sierra Avenue and Vista Del Lago as an 88 Foot Arterial. This street was carried over to CCM-4. However, this street, in a slightly different configuration, is already built as a two-lane collector through existing developments and is called Blackburn Road. This street is not needed with the addition of “A” Street and should be deleted from the plan.

Reclassification

- Chicago Avenue southerly of Roberts Road and Gentian Avenue between Chicago Avenue and Wood Road should be reclassified as 66 Foot Local, like Roberts Road.
- Note #4 should read:

These streets ~~Roberts Road~~ shall be a 66-Foot Local **Roadways serving as alternate routes.**

20. **Add Policy CCM-8.4 on page CCM-26.**

The policy should be, as noted in the Greater Riverside Chambers of Commerce General Plan Task Force Letter (General Plan Figure C – Greater Riverside Chambers of Commerce General Plan Task Force Letter, Items for Inclusion Item #7), as follows:

Give priority to sidewalk and curb construction to those areas in proximity to schools with youth pedestrian traffic.

21. **Cross reference Objective CCM-8 (page CCM-25) to Objective ED-4 (page E-17) in the Education Element.**

22. **Add Policy CCM-9.9 (page CCM-30).**

The policy should be, as noted in the Greater Riverside Chambers of Commerce General Plan Task Force Letter (General Plan Figure C – Greater Riverside Chambers of Commerce General Plan Task Force Letter, Items for inclusions Item #8), as follows:

Encourage development of walkways between Downtown Riverside and the Downtown Metrolink Station.

Items of Note – No Recommendations

23. The Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC) and the Washington/Alessandro Committee both voted to include the extension of Central Avenue between Chicago Avenue and Fairview/Central Avenue on the Master plan of Roadways. The traffic model found that this new roadway segment did lessen the congestion at the Alessandro Boulevard/Arlington Avenue/Chicago Avenue intersection. However, there was an increase of 22,000 vehicles per day on the connector (Fairview Road) which resulted in a direct impact to a single family residential neighborhood. This information was presented at a City Council/City Planning Commission workshop. The City Council directed that the Central Avenue connection not be a part of the new Master Plan of Roadways.
24. During the hearing process the Planning Commission requested information on the approved circulation system for the County in the City's sphere of influence. General Plan Figure J – County Circulation System is the County's approved Circulation Element for the City's sphere area.
25. In the correspondence received from the Greater Riverside Chambers of Commerce General Plan Task Force (General Plan Figure C – Greater Riverside Chambers of Commerce General Plan Task Force Letter, Recommended Changes Item #1) it is recommended that there be greater discussion of all major corridors.

26. At a workshop a Planning Commissioner suggested a policy encouraging community parking facilities in different business districts throughout the City.

HOUSING ELEMENT

Recommended Changes

27. **Add an implementation tool.**

The tool will be to re-visit the Housing Element to place greater emphasis on Senior Housing. The Senior Housing Task Force has made this recommendation and staff concurs.

Items of Note – No Recommendations

28. The City's current Housing Element was prepared in January 2001. However, this element was not certified by the State Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) as required by the State's Government Code. The reason HCD did not approve the current Element was because it did not provide enough potential sites for residential development opportunities. As part of this General Plan update the Housing Element was updated to ensure consistency with new General Plan and Zoning Code regarding sites available for new housing. The proposed Housing Element has been reviewed by HCD, and on September 15, 2004, HCD reported to the City that the revised Element has tentative certification as it now indicates potential residential development opportunities and the City should move forward with adoption of this Element and submission to HCD for certification.
29. Housing Elements must be updated and approved by HCD every five years and are on a cycle with HCD. The City is currently in the middle of a cycle. The next Housing Element update is due in June of 2006. However, it is believed that the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) will be asking for a two-year extension for the 2006-2011 cycle. It is not known at this time whether the requested extension of time will be approved.

ARTS AND CULTURE ELEMENT

No changes are recommended.

Items of Note – No Recommendations

30. As noted in the letter from the Greater Riverside Chambers of Commerce General Plan Task Force (General Plan Figure C – Greater Riverside Chambers of Commerce General Plan Task Force Letter, Support of Specific Proposals Item 2), the Chamber supports Policy AC-4.28 (page AC-21).
31. As noted in the letter from the Greater Riverside Chambers of Commerce General Plan Task Force (General Plan Figure C – Greater Riverside Chambers of Commerce General Plan Task Force Letter, Opposition to Specific Proposals Item 3), the Chamber is opposed to a

“Percent for the Arts” program funded by developer fees, page AC-17 under “Art in Public Places.”

32. At one of the workshops a Commissioner asked if the Jensen Alvarado Ranch and the Trujillo Adobe could be added to the Element under “Our Rich Community Resources” (page AC-3).

EDUCATION ELEMENT

No changes are recommended.

Items of Note – No Recommendations

33. As noted in the letter from the Greater Riverside Chambers of Commerce General Plan Task Force (General Plan Figure C – Greater Riverside Chambers of Commerce General Plan Task Force Letter, Items for Inclusion Item 9), the Chamber recommends a policy to encourage partnerships with school districts for cooperative use and maintenance of school fields and City parks. This policy exists in the Education Element on page E-14 as Policy ED-2.1.

PUBLIC SAFETY ELEMENT

Recommended Changes

34. **Include a map of the Neighborhood Policing Centers in the Public Safety Element.**

After the publication of this draft document the Police Department released a map of their Neighborhood Policing Centers, also known as Precincts, (General Plan Figure K – Neighborhood Policing Centers). On Page PS-37 the precinct organization is discussed in the General Plan and staff recommends inserting this map into the General Plan in this location.

35. **Authorize staff to modify Figure PS-6 – Airport Safety Zones and Influence Areas (page PS-25).**

This figure will need to be modified as necessary to reflect the Riverside County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (RCALUCP) and the March Joint Land Use Study upon their adoption by the City. The City is currently working with the Airport Land Use Commission on finalizing the RCALUCP and the March Joint Land Use Study is just beginning.

NOISE ELEMENT

Recommended Changes

- 36. Authorize staff to modify Figures –8 – Riverside and Flabob Airport Noise Contours (page –29) and –9 – March ARB Noise Contours (page –31).**

These figures will need to be modified based upon the RCALUCP and the March Joint Land Use Study.

Items of Note – No Recommendations

- 37. During the hearing process it was recommended by one of the Planning Commissioners that more detailed noise studies of point source railroad noise be completed to provide greater documentation in support of grade crossings.**

AIR QUALITY ELEMENT

Recommended Changes

- 38. Replace the studies cited in the Air Quality Element with more relevant studies.**

Both the Citizen Advisory Committee and the City Planning Commission recommended that the studies cited under Key Studies beginning on Page AQ-6 be replaced with studies more relevant to Southern California. SCAQMD has provided additional information on studies more relevant to Southern California, and staff recommends replacing the existing studies with these more relevant studies.

- 39. Make the changes noted in the memo from Public Works Department attached as General Plan Figure L – Public Works Recommended Air Quality Updates.**

Public Works is recommending these changes to better reflect current City practices and programs.

OPEN SPACE AND CONSERVATION ELEMENT

Recommended Changes

- 40. Add a policy to Objective OS-2 (page OS-9) addressing light pollution.**

The City Planning Commission recommended that the City address light pollution under this Element. The following policy is recommended:

Review the feasibility of creating a light pollution or “night time sky” ordinance.

Items of Note – No Recommendations

41. In the letter from the Greater Riverside Chambers of Commerce General Plan Task Force (General Plan Figure C – Greater Riverside Chambers of Commerce General Plan Task Force Letter, Support of Specific Proposals Item 1), the Chamber supports Policy OS-1.11 on page OS-8 concerning the City acquisition of identified open space land.
42. Also in the letter from the Greater Riverside Chambers of Commerce General Plan Task Force (General Plan Figure C – Greater Riverside Chambers of Commerce General Plan Task Force Letter, Opposition to Specific Proposals Item 1), the Chamber opposes Policy OS-4.3 which would explore the possibility of establishing a fee for land banking to create buffers or to purchase sensitive lands.

PUBLIC FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE ELEMENT

Recommended Changes

43. **Add a policy under Objective PF-1 (page PF-13) supporting superior water quality.**

This idea is noted in the letter from the Greater Riverside Chambers of Commerce General Plan Task Force (General Plan Figure C – Greater Riverside Chambers of Commerce General Plan Task Force Letter, Items for Inclusion Item 4) as follows:

Policy PF-1.7: Protect local groundwater resources from localized and regional contamination sources, including septic tanks, underground storage tanks, industrial businesses, urban runoff and other sources of contamination.

This policy should cross reference Objective OS-10 (page OS-50).

44. **Add a policy under Objective PF-9 (page PF-32) supporting University California Riverside's proposed medical school and Riverside Community College and California Baptist University's nursing training programs.**

This was noted in the letter from the Greater Riverside Chambers of Commerce General Plan Task Force (General Plan Figure C – Greater Riverside Chambers of Commerce General Plan Task Force Letter, Items for Inclusion Item 5) as follows:

Policy PF-9.4: In an effort to avoid staffing shortages, support the University California Riverside's proposed medical school and Riverside Community College and California Baptist University's nursing training programs where feasible.

Items of Note – No Recommendations

45. Another item noted in the letter from the Greater Riverside Chambers of Commerce General Plan Task Force (General Plan Figure C – Greater Riverside Chambers of Commerce

General Plan Task Force Letter, Opposition to Specific Proposals Item 2), the Chamber opposes Policy PF-7.7 on page PF-30 which examines the option of the city owning a television station.

PARK AND RECREATION ELEMENT

Recommended Changes

46. Amend Figure PR-1 – Parks, Open Space and Trails Map.

Per the letter from the Riverside Land Conservancy (General Plan Figure M – Riverside Land Conservancy Letter) Figure PR-1 should be amended to reflect the Springbrook Wash Trail alignment as shown in the exhibits attached to the letter.

47. Add an Implementation Tool to place high priority on having the trails on PR-1 placed into GIS for accuracy.

Items of Note – No Recommendations

48. At a number of the hearings the Commissioners have asked questions concerning how the trails map, Figure PR-1 – Parks, Open Space and Trails Map (page PR-17) in the General Plan relates to the Park and Recreation Master Plan adopted in 2003. The General Plan incorporates the Master Plan completely to give more weight to this important plan. To help the Planning Commission compare the figures in the General Plan with the figures from the Master Plan the relevant Master Plan figures have been provided as exhibits (General Plan Figure N – Park and Recreation Master Plan 2003 Exhibits).

HISTORIC PRESERVATION ELEMENT

No changes are recommended.

GLOSSARY

Recommended Changes

49. Add a definition for “linkages.”

The definition should read as follows:

Linkage	Open space connection for purposes of habitat connectivity, trail connection or a combination of the two. <i>See definition in the Subdivision Code.</i>
---------	--

EXHIBITS

1. General Plan Figure A – Urban Design Framework Map
2. General Plan Figure B – Victoria Avenue Forever Letter

3. General Plan Figure C – Greater Riverside Chambers of Commerce General Plan Task Force Letter
4. General Plan Figure D – Citizen Advisory Committee Changes
5. General Plan Figure E – Sites A - I
6. General Plan Figure F – Sites J - V
7. General Plan Figure G – Sites W - AAA
8. General Plan Figure H – VHDR - CAC Site 16
9. General Plan Figure I – Southern Sphere
10. General Plan Figure J – County Circulation System
11. General Plan Figure K – Neighborhood Policing Centers
12. General Plan Figure L – Public Works Recommended Air Quality Updates
13. General Plan Figure M – Riverside Land Conservancy Letter
14. General Plan Figure N – Park and Recreation Master Plan 2003 Exhibits
14. General Plan Figure O – Comment Letters Concerning the General Plan

G:\GENPLAN\CPC Staff Report\Final Report\General_Plan_Staff_report.wpd